		i i i	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/939,294	DING ET AL.	
Notice of Allowability	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sandra M. Nolan	1772	
The MAILING DATE of this communication apper claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS rewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) OTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RI the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313	(OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this apport or other appropriate communication GHTS. This application is subject to	plication. If not included will be mailed in due course	e. THIS ne initiative
igtimes This communication is responsive to the	6 October 2004.		
\square The allowed claim(s) is/are <u>1-3,7-34, 37-85 and 91-95</u> .			
IX The drawings filed on $8h^4/o$ are accepted by the Examine	r.		
 Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority unally a) All b) Some* c) None of the: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * Certified copies not received: 	been received. been received in Application No		om the
opplicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of the triangle of triangle of the triangle of triangle of the triangle of triangle	of this communication to file a reply IENT of this application.	complying with the requiren	nents
A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be subm INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which give			E OF
CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") mus (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftspers 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Paper No./Mail Date Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1 each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the state of the property of o	on's Patent Drawing Review(PTO- s Amendment / Comment or in the C .84(c)) should be written on the drawi	Office action of) of
□ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the depo- attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT	sit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL I FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGIC	must be submitted. Note t AL MATERIAL.	he
tachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		5. Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152))
☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	6. ⊠ Interview Summary Paper No./Mail Da		
 ✓ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No./Mail Date 12-10-04 ✓ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit 	98), 7. ⊠ Examiner's Amend	 7. ⊠ Examiner's Amendment/Comment 8. ⊠ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance 	e
of Biological Material	9. Other		
S.M. Nolan-Royford SANDRAM. NOLAN-SCRYFORD PRIMARY EXAMINER			

S. Patent and Trademark Office TOL-37 (Rev. 1-04) Application/Control Number: 09/939,294 Page 2

Art Unit: 1772

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

- 2. Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Mr. Robert Barrett (312/807-4204) on 04 January 2005.
- 3. The application has been amended as follows:

In the Claims

Claims 35-36 and 86-90 are cancelled and their captions have been changed from "(withdrawn)" to -- (canceled) --.

In line 1 of each of claims 17-34, 37-85 and 91-95, the expression "(withdrawn)" has been deleted and replaced with – (previously presented) --.

Remarks

Non-elected pending claims covering the blends of the invention have been rejoined with claims 7-12. Non-elected pending claims covering embodiments that do not call for blends have been cancelled.

The captioning of the rejoined claims has been revised to comport with current USPTO practice.

Reasons for Allowance

Withdrawal of Rejections

4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Art Unit: 1772

5. All of the prior art rejections set out in the 20 July 2004 office action are withdrawn in view of the arguments presented on page 12 of the 26 October 2004 response.

Summary of Base Claims

6. The base claims are claims 1, 17, 25, 33, 37, 53, 69, 70 and 83. They can be summarized as follows:

<u>Claim 1</u> covers a polymer blend useful for making medical products comprising:

- -1 to 99% of a first low crystallinity syndiotactic 1,2-polybutadiene having a first melting temperature, and
- -1 to 99% of a second syndiotactic 1,2-polybutadiene having a melting temperature higher than that of the first syndiotactic 1,2-polybutadiene.

Claim 17 covers a tubing having a sidewall made of a blend comprising:

- -1 to 99% of a first 1,2-polybutadiene having a first melting temperature, and
- -1 to 99% of a second 1,2-polybutadiene having a melting temperature higher than that of the first syndiotactic 1,2-polybutadiene

<u>Claim 25</u> covers a tubing having a sidewall made of the blend recited in claim 1, which tubing is exposed to sterilizing radiation.

<u>Claim 33</u> covers tubing for use with an infusion pump made of the blend recited in claim 1, which tubing is exposed to sterilizing radiation.

Claim 37 covers multiple layered tubing comprising:

-a first layer of the blend recited in claim 17, and

Art Unit: 1772

-a second layer of a polymeric material disposed concentrically with respect to the first layer.

<u>Claim 53</u> covers a multiple layered tubing comprising:

- (a) a first layer of a blend of:
- -1 to 99% of a first low crystallinity syndiotactic 1,2-polybutadiene having a first melting temperature below about 90 degrees C, and
- -1 to 99% of a second syndiotactic 1,2-polybutadiene having a melting temperature higher than about 91 degrees C.
- (b) a second layer of a polymeric material disposed concentrically with respect to the first layer.

<u>Claim 69</u> covers a multiple layered tubing comprising:

- (a) a first layer of a blend of:
- -1 to 99% of a first low crystallinity syndiotactic 1,2-polybutadiene having a first melting temperature below about 90 degrees C, and
- -1 to 99% of a second syndiotactic 1,2-polybutadiene having a melting temperature higher than about 91 degrees C.
- (b) a second layer of a polymeric material disposed concentrically with respect to the first layer,

wherein the tubing has been exposed to sterilizing radiation.

<u>Claim 70</u> covers a multiple layered tubing comprising:

(a) a first layer of a blend of:

Art Unit: 1772

-1 to 99% of a first low crystallinity syndiotactic 1,2-polybutadiene having a first melting temperature below about 90 degrees C, and

- -1 to 99% of a second syndiotactic 1,2-polybutadiene having a melting temperature higher than about 91 degrees C.
- (b) a second layer of a polymeric material disposed concentrically with respect to the first layer,

wherein the tubing has been exposed to sterilizing radiation.

Claim 83 covers a multiple layered tubing comprising:

- (a) a first layer of a blend of:
- -1 to 99% of a first low crystallinity syndiotactic 1,2-polybutadiene having a first melting temperature below about 90 degrees C, and
- -1 to 99% of a second syndiotactic 1,2-polybutadiene having a melting higher than about 91 degrees C.:
- (b) a second layer of a polymeric material disposed concentrically with respect to the first layer and attached thereto, which second layer is a blend comprising:
- -1 to 99% of a third low crystallinity syndiotactic 1,2-polybutadiene having a first melting temperature below about 90 degrees C, and
- -1 to 99% of a fourth 1,2-polybutadiene having a melting higher than about 91 degrees C.,

wherein the tubing has been exposed to sterilizing radiation.

None of the available prior art teaches or suggests medical products/tubing made from blends of 1,2-polymerized butadienes, which blended polymers meet the melting

Art Unit: 1772

temperature requirements recited in claims 1, 17, 25, 37, 53, 69, 70 and 83. The claimed 1,2-isomers are distinguished from 1,3- and 1,4-isomers at page 4, lines 28-30 of applicants' the specification.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be addressed to Sandra M. Nolan-Rayford, at telephone number 571/272-1495. She can normally be reached Monday through Thursday, from 6:30 am to 4:00 pm, Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, her supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached at 571/272-1498.

The fax number for patent application documents is 703/872-9306.

S.M. Nelm-Royford S.M. Nolan-Rayford

Primary Examiner

Technology Center 1700

09939294(20050104)

SANDRA M. NOLAN -PRAYFORI)
PRIMARY EXAMINER